United States Department of the Interior
California Department of Parks and Recreation

Redwood National and State Parks
1111 Second Street
Crescent City, California 95531

CALIFORNIA STATE PARKS

D22 (Aubell Maintenance Facility)

June 20, 2005

Interested Parties:

On behalf of Redwood National and State Parks, we are presenting for your review and comment a Draft Revised Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Revised IS/MND) for the Redwood Maintenance Facility Relocation project.

The National Park Service (NPS) and California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) propose to develop a new maintenance facility for Redwood National and State Parks near Crescent City off Aubell Lane on land currently owned by CDPR. The new maintenance facility would consolidate federal and State maintenance operations, and would be jointly operated by NPS and CDPR. CDPR would transfer to NPS the land and road and utility rights of way needed to construct the facility. The Aubell facility would replace the existing NPS maintenance facility at Requa, which would be restored to a natural state to the extent feasible. The Aubell facility would additionally replace a CDPR maintenance complex formerly located near Hiouchi at Jedediah Smith Redwoods State Park that was irreparably damaged by fire. If approved, project construction would likely take place from approximately spring 2007 through spring 2009.

The revised study addresses a change in the proposed location on the Aubell property for the new facility. The original study proposed that the new facility be located at the intersection of Aubell Lane and Elk Valley Road. In response to public input about impacts on the neighborhood, the facility is now proposed to be located along Aubell Lane at the "Midway" site to move it back from Elk Valley Road to a well-screened area that is about 1000 feet from the nearest house.

This project was analyzed pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and the California Environmental Quality Act in the Redwood Maintenance Facility Relocation Environmental Assessment and Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (EA/IS/MND), dated December 2004, California State Clearinghouse #2004122039, and incorporated into the revised study as Appendix A. The December 2004 EA fully described the Midway site as one alternative location and evaluated the impacts.

NPS and CDPR will hold a public meeting on this project from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Monday, July 11, 2005 at the Elk Valley Rancheria headquarters at 2332 Howland Hill Road, Crescent City, California 95531.

The NPS and CDPR are accepting comments on this revised study through July 29, 2005. Following the comment period, all comments from the current and the earlier public review will be considered before a final decision is made.

Comments on the Redwood Maintenance Facility Relocation Draft Revised IS/MND must be submitted in writing by July 29, 2005 and may be sent to:

Mail: Superintendents, Redwood National and State Parks
ATTN.: Redwood Maintenance Facility Relocation
1111 Second Street
Crescent City, California 95531

Fax: 707/464-1812
Email: redw_superintendent@nps.gov

Copies of the revised study have been distributed to the general public, elected officials, agencies, federally recognized tribes, organizations, and local businesses. Copies are also available at local libraries in Crescent City, Arcata, and Eureka and at park offices in Crescent City and Eureka, and on the internet at http://www.nps.gov/redw/pphtml/documents.html and http://www.parks.ca.gov/default.asp?page_id=981.

For additional information, please call Ray Cozby at 707-464-6101, extension 5030. We appreciate your interest in this planning effort and welcome your participation.

Sincerely,

Bill Pierce
National Park Superintendent

Marilyn Murphy
State Parks Superintendent

Enclosure

Redwood Maintenance Facility Relocation
Revised Draft IS/MND
Redwood National and State Parks

State Clearinghouse #2004122039

Recirculated June 2005

California Department of Parks and Recreation

Redwood National and State Parks
Lead Agencies: National Park Service and California Department of Parks and Recreation

ABSTRACT

The National Park Service (NPS) and California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) propose to develop a new maintenance facility for Redwood National and State Parks (the parks) at the Aubell area, which is located near Crescent City on what is currently CDPR-owned land. The new jointly operated maintenance facility would consolidate federal and state park maintenance operations. The Aubell facility would replace an existing NPS maintenance facility at the Requa area, which would be restored to the extent feasible. The new facility would also replace a CDPR maintenance complex that was irreparably damaged by fire in December, 1994. This project was analyzed pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and the California Environmental Quality Act (California State Clearinghouse #2004122039). The actions identified in the Redwood Maintenance Facility Relocation Environmental Assessment, circulated in December 2004, and the Draft Revised Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, described herein, would be implemented consistent with the parks' *General Management Plan / General Plan*.

The Redwood Maintenance Facility Relocation Environmental Assessment (EA) and this Draft Revised Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Revised IS/MND) analyze the environmental impacts that would occur as a result of project implementation. The EA identifies and analyzes three alternatives. Alternative 1 is the No Action Alternative and represents the status quo; the existing maintenance facilities would remain unchanged, except for normal maintenance and repair. Under both Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, the agencies propose to relocate the maintenance facility from the Requa area to the Aubell area. Under Alternative 2, the Requa area would be restored and the new maintenance facility would be located at the Elk Valley Road site at Aubell. Alternative 3 would restore the Requa area to a lesser degree than Alternative 2, and the new maintenance facility would be located at the Midway site at Aubell. The EA describes Alternative 2 as the Proposed Project/Preferred Alternative under CEQA. This Draft Revised IS/MND reflects the change in the Proposed Project/Preferred Alternative for the location of the maintenance facility at Aubell. The Proposed Project has been changed from the Elk Valley site in Alternative 2 of the EA to the Midway site described in Alternative 3.

This change in construction sites at Aubell is in response to public input on the draft environmental document circulated in December-January 2004-05. The project would now be developed within a well-screened area that is about 1,000 feet from the nearest house. This Draft Revised IS/MND also analyzes the environmental impacts that would occur with a water system that connects to the proposed water system on adjacent Elk Valley Rancheria property, rather than connecting to the Bertsch Ocean View Water District via a new waterline along Elk Valley Road as described in the EA. Finally, an addition to the project description that is analyzed in this document is the transfer from CDPR to NPS of the land to be occupied by the maintenance facility and the rights of way for the associated utility systems.

Draft Revised CEQA Initial Study

1. **Project Title:** Redwood Maintenance Facility Relocation

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Redwood National and State Parks
National Park Service and California Department of Parks and Recreation
1111 Second Street
Crescent City, CA 95531

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Marilyn Murphy, Redwood National and State Park Superintendent
(707) 464-6101, extension 5051

4. **Project Location:** Aubell Area
Aubell Lane
Crescent City, CA 95531

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Redwood National and State Parks
National Park Service and California Department of Parks and Recreation
1111 Second Street
Crescent City, CA 95531

6. **General Plan Designation:** State and Federal Lands

7. **Zoning:** The Elk Valley Road and Midway sites are zoned Agriculture and the Existing Ranch site is zoned Forestry in the Del Norte County Zoning Code. (For clarification of the sites see the Environmental Assessment, incorporated as Appendix A, figure II-2 in Chapter II, Alternatives).

8. **Description of Project:**

The proposed Redwood National and State Parks maintenance facility would be developed in a 10-acre field in the middle of the Aubell Ranch property near Crescent City, California (See description of the Aubell area in the Redwood Maintenance Facility Relocation Environmental Assessment (EA) Alternative 2, Chapter II, Alternatives). The new maintenance facility would be sited outside a 125-foot setback from an unnamed intermittent tributary of Elk Creek.

The land occupied by the proposed facility and the rights-of-way for the utility systems, including a leach field, is currently owned by CDPR. As part of this project, the National Park Service boundary will be adjusted to include the entire 69.9 acre Aubell property.

The 69.9 acre boundary adjustment is described as follows in the public notice prepared by Gregory Gress, Chief, Pacific Land Resources Program Center, Pacific West Region. The notice was published in the Crescent City *Daily Triplicate*, the local newspaper of record for Del Norte County, for three consecutive weeks on May 11, May 18, and May 25, 2005:

> Portions of Section 23, Township 16 North, Range 1 Wst, Humboldt Meridian, described as Parcels 1, 2, 4 and 4 as shown on the parcel map filed in the Office of the County Recorder of Del Norte County, California, on December 9, 1983, in Book 5 of Parcel Maps, Page 96.
>
> ALSO, a non-exclusive right-of-way for road and utility purposes over and across the following described land: BEGINNING at the Northeast corner of the South half of the Northwest quarter of Section 23, Township 16 North, Range 1 West, Humboldt Meridian; and running thence West along the subdivisional line, 64.85 feet; thence southeasterly, 91.76 feet, more or less, to a point on the North and South quarter section line of said Section 23, that is 64.85 feet southerly from the point of beginning; thence northerly along quarter section line, 64.85 feet to the point of beginning.

CDPR has stated in a letter to NPS that they have no objection to this federal administrative change. In addition, the State will transfer ownership of 17 acres of the land included in the boundary adjustment to NPS because the NPS cannot invest in the facility until it acquires an interest in the property. This acreage is the portion of the Midway site parcel to be occupied by the maintenance facility and the rights-of-way for the associated utility systems. The legal description for the land to be transferred is as follows:

> A portion of Section 23, Township 16 North, Range 1 West, Humboldt Base and Meridian described as Parcel 2 as shown on the parcel map filed in the Office of the County Recorder of Del Norte County, California on December 9, 1983 in Book 5 of Parcel Maps, Page 96, together with a right of way for road and utility purposes over that portion of Parcel 1 of the above referenced parcel map which is designated for such purpose.

The maintenance facility would include a variety of work, shop, storage and maintenance office functions. Maintenance facility operations would include welding, electrical repair work, carpentry, equipment repair, telecommunications operation, sign development and maintenance, groundskeeping, road and trail maintenance, and related office support space.

NPS and CDPR would consolidate functions within 2 structures: 1) a main shop building and 2) a combined central warehouse and covered storage "pole barn" building. This

consolidation would minimize the amount of perimeter wall and developed footprint, and improve HVAC energy conservation and other building system efficiencies. The buildings would be oriented in an east-west configuration to provide the maximum sun exposure, optimum day-lighting potential, and other passive solar opportunities. The building is being designed to give a more residential feel to blend better with the neighborhood. However, the site is well-screened from all but one house, which is on a ridge about 1,000-feet northeast of the site.

The new maintenance facility would include sustainable technologies to the extent practicable and would include approximately 30,000 square feet of building area for the main shop and warehouse, including a 4,000 square foot open-sided structure attached to the warehouse for covered equipment storage.

The maintenance facility would have about 200,000 square feet (about 4.6 acres) of developed area, including about 75,000 square feet of paved lots and yard, 38,000 square feet of gravel lots, 44,000 square feet of unpaved outdoor storage yard, 15,000 square feet of landscaping and screen planting, 2,000 square feet of sidewalks, and the approximately 30,000 square feet of buildings mentioned above. Another roughly 150,000 square feet (about 3.4 acres) of road shoulders, drainage swales, leachfield sites, and other disturbed ground at Aubell would be replanted in grass following construction.

About 10,000 cubic yards of earth moving would occur for site grading to develop level building pads and parking lots and create appropriate drainage patterns. Perimeter fencing, an access gate, site lighting, and signs would be installed. Site lighting will be kept to the absolute minimum needed for safety and security to minimize impacts on the neighbors and save energy.

The facility would include approximately 100 equipment, park vehicle, and employee parking spaces, including an appropriate number of parking spaces that meet or exceed the minimum requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act and other applicable accessibility standards.

The estimated daily water requirement for the new maintenance facility would be up to 2,000 gallons per day, including demand for building uses and some minor hand watering requirements until plants are established. The fire flow requirements for the new facility, which would be equipped with a fire sprinkler system, would be approximately 1,500 gallons per minute for two hours (180,000 gallons) with 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure at the fire hydrant. As proposed in the EA, water was to be supplied to the maintenance facility by connecting to the Bertsch Ocean View Water District's public water supply system. In the currently proposed project, water would be supplied to the maintenance facility by connecting to the proposed water system on adjacent Elk Valley Rancheria property. A 10-inch water pipe would be installed on the Aubell site to a connection point at the boundary between the two properties.

The proposed project would include an onsite wastewater treatment and disposal system. It would be designed for up to 1,400 gallons of wastewater per day, but actual use is expected to be much lower. The wastewater treatment system would include a septic tank and leach field system connected by a sewer line. The leach field would be located on the west side of the creek at what was referred to as the Elk Valley Road

site, where soils are more suitable for a disposal field. The disposal field would be more than 300 feet away from the creek and well out of the floodplain. The effluent pipe would run parallel to Aubell Lane and be buried in the road shoulder as it passes over the Elk Creek tributary. The pipe would be double lined to protect the creek in case of a break.

For stormwater treatment the site would be divided into two watersheds (north and south) where surface run-off from the parking lots would be directed toward drainage inlets and be piped to the west side of the site. A stormwater separator would be placed at the last drainage inlet prior to off-site discharge.

A stormwater separator is a structure that efficiently removes sediment and hydrocarbons from stormwater run-off, and stores pollutants for safe and easy removal. A typical stormwater separator is designed to remove more than 80% of Total Suspended Solids (TSS) and captures Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) in stormwater runoff.

The proposed stormwater separator is designed as an in-line structure. Maintenance of the separator consists of annually vacuuming out the solids and oils from the structure.

The pipe that discharges the flow offsite would have an outfall structure to dissipate and spread the flow over the site. No structures would be placed in the creek's riparian area.

The new maintenance facility would be supplied with three-phase power. The overhead electrical line that parallels Elk Valley Road has three-phase power. The existing powerline that parallels Aubell Lane would be modified to carry three-phase power. The service line from the overhead line to the building (about 250 feet) would be placed underground.

The proposed project would include road modifications to the existing single lane Aubell Lane to accommodate maintenance vehicles and increased traffic following the development of the new facilities. The intersection of Aubell Lane and Elk Valley Road would be relocated to the north to allow for better vehicular sight distances and safer turning. It will be designed to meet County standards. In addition, approximately 1,800 feet of Aubell Lane would be widened to two lanes to provide adequate access for park vehicles to the proposed facility and for public access to a planned trail head at the end of Aubell Lane. A new larger, "fish friendly" culvert would be installed to replace an existing undersized culvert over the Elk Creek tributary's crossing. The culvert would accommodate the road widening and adequately pass a 100-year flood event.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting.

See description of Aubell area setting in the EA, Chapter III, Affected Environment.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required.

See the EA, Chapter V, Consultation and Coordination

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology / Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials		☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
☐ Land Use / Planning		
☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing
☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation / Traffic
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	☒ None of the Above

CEQA Summary of Findings

The lead agency, as identified under CEQA, is the public agency with primary approval authority over the proposed project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15051(b)(1), the lead agency for the proposed project, for the purposes of CEQA compliance, is the California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR).

Pursuant to CEQA, an initial study is conducted by a lead agency to determine if a project may have a significant effect on the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15063[a]). If there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report (EIR) must be prepared, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15064(a). However, if the lead agency determines that revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant mitigate the potentially significant effects to a less than significant level, a mitigated negative declaration may be prepared instead of an EIR (CEQA Guidelines §15070[b]). The lead agency prepares a written statement describing the reasons a proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, why an EIR need not be prepared. This initial study/mitigated negative declaration conforms to the content requirements under CEQA Guidelines §15071. Pursuant to CEQA guidance, an initial study analyzes the environmental impacts of the proposed project only and does not include identification or analysis of alternatives. For the purposes of the CEQA analysis of development of park maintenance facilities at the Aubell area, the proposed project is Alternative 3 in the EA.

Chapter IV of the EA, Environmental Consequences, and this Revised CEQA Initial Study, contain the environmental analysis that identifies the potential environmental impacts (by environmental issue) and provides a brief discussion of each impact that could result from proposed development of park maintenance facilities at the Aubell area. Based on the results of the Initial Study and the supporting environmental analysis provided in the EA, the proposed Redwood Maintenance Facility Relocation project

would result in less than significant impacts for the following issues: aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, utilities and service systems, and cumulative impacts.

In accordance with §15064(f) of the CEQA Guidelines, a mitigated negative declaration shall be prepared if the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment after the inclusion of mitigation measures in the project. Based on the available project information, the CEQA Initial Study and the environmental analysis presented in Chapter IV of the EA, Environmental Consequences, there is no substantial evidence that, after the full implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment. As such, it appears that a mitigated negative declaration is the appropriate CEQA environmental document for this project.

Significant changes to the project scope as outlined in the project description have resulted in the re-evaluation of this project and the circulation of this revised draft. Any further significant changes to the project scope, proposed mitigations, or identification of additional adverse impacts and/or mitigation measures would result in re-evaluation of the project and recirculation of another revised draft mitigated negative declaration for public comment. Once public review of the draft mitigated negative declaration is completed and comments/concerns regarding the document have been addressed, CDPR will consider the advisability the project, in light of the whole record, and determine if CDPR intends to carry out the project as proposed. If the project is approved, a notice of determination would be filed with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research/State Clearinghouse, identifying the final project scope, determination of environmental effects, and acceptance of proposed mitigations and findings (CEQA Guidelines §15373). A final mitigated negative declaration would also be prepared in conjunction with the notice of determination and would include comments received during the public review period, agency response to those comments, corrections to the draft mitigated negative declaration in response to comments and reviews, and a mitigation monitoring and reporting plan.

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Marilyn Murphy — June 17, 2005

Signature — Date

Marilyn Murphy
California Dept. of Parks and Recreation

Environmental Impacts:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☒	☐	☐

See the EA: Alternative 3 scenic resources analysis in Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences, and Appendix C, Mitigation Measures. The building is being designed to give a more residential feel than the standard maintenance facility in order to blend better with the neighborhood. However, the site is well-screened from all but one house, which is on a ridge about 1,000-feet northeast of the site.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Aubell area is not considered Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project would not convert existing farmland to non-agricultural use.

III. **AIR QUALITY:** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. **Would the project:**				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

See Alternative 3 air quality analysis in the EA, Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences and Appendix C, Mitigation Measures.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Southern Oregon/Northern California Coho salmon (federal threatened, state endangered) and coastal cutthroat trout (State SSC) are present in the unnamed tributary on the Midway site. A biological assessment prepared under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act concludes that the proposed project may affect individuals, but is not likely to adversely affect Southern Oregon/Northern California coho and their critical habitat or Essential Fish Habitat. The BA includes the following additional measures beyond those in the EA, which are incorporated into this MND, in order to minimize effects of this project on aquatic habitat:

1. Culvert replacements shall be conducted only during times of low stream flow but prior to upstream migration of adult anadromous salmonids. The stream course shall not be dewatered when eggs or alevins are present. Replacement activities shall avoid, to the maximum extent feasible, removal of any riparian vegetation. Temporary low water crossings shall be designed, and inspected daily, to insure fish passage. The construction schedule for culvert replacement will be carefully timed in consultation with the park fish biologist.

2. All stream crossings shall be constructed to accommodate at least the 100-year flood, including associated bed load and debris. Fish passage shall be provided and maintained at all road crossings of existing and potential fish-bearing streams. Crossings will be constructed and

maintained to prevent diversion of stream flow out of the channel and down the road in event of a crossing failure.

3. Listed salmonids that would be in the area under construction shall be removed prior to and during stream flow diversion and dewatering and relocated to a suitable instream location immediately up or down stream of the work area.This will be done by RNSP Fishery Biologists by using an electroshocker and netting methods. RNSP Fishery Biologists will follow NOAA Fisheries guidelines. All efforts shall be taken to neither exhaust nor kill listed salmonids during collection and relocation.

4. Install water bars in temporary access roads located on slopes to control and reduce surface scouring.

5. Stream flow must be diverted around culvert construction sites. The diverted flows shall be returned to their natural stream course as soon as construction is complete and prior to the rainy season. Any wastewater from project activities and de-watering is disposed of off-site in a location that will not drain directly into a stream channel or carry sediment laden water into a stream channel. Installation of hay bales and silt fences will be completed before flow is restored to its natural stream channel. All disturbed areas shall be winterized as well as stabilized prior to the rainy season and as needed and shall be restored to pre-work conditions. Note: Presence of alevins or eggs will be determined by a RNSP Fishery Biologist prior to dewatering.

6. Sediment delivery to streams from roads shall be minimized. Outsloping of the roadway surface is preferred, except in cases where outsloping would increase sediment delivery to streams or where outsloping is unfeasible or unsafe. Road drainage shall be routed away from potentially unstable channels, fills, and hillslopes. Side casting shall be restricted as necessary to prevent the introduction of sediment into streams.

7. Culvert and dip construction shall take place from the bank, if possible, or on a temporary, removable pad underlain with filter fabric.

8. Work activities in active streambeds (areas of flowing water) will occur during periods of low flow (e.g., June through October).

9. When constructing the new arch culvert for the northernmost tributary that crosses Aubell Lane, the agencies will avoid placement of new structures, such as footings, within the streambed.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

10. Removal, installation, or operation of hazardous material storage tanks shall comply with federal and state regulations.

11. Disruption of natural hydrologic flow paths, including diversion of stream flow and interception of surface and subsurface flows, shall be minimized.

12. To minimize the effects of effluent entering the stream if the sewer line is ever damaged, the sewer line will be double lined and placed in the fill of the arch culvert where the line crosses the stream.

For additional analysis and mitigations for biological resources, see the EA: Alternative 3 biological resources analyses in Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences, and Appendix C, Mitigation Measures.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

See the EA: Alternative 3 cultural resources analysis in Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences, and Appendix C, Mitigation Measures.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*

See the EA: Alternative 3 geology, geologic hazards, and soils analysis in Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences, and Appendix C, Mitigation Measures.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☒	☐	☐

See the EA: Alternative 3 park operations and facilities analysis in Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences, and Appendix C, Mitigation Measures.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a				

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
manner which would result in substantial erosion of siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☒	☐	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☒	☐	☐
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j) Inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☒	☐

See the EA: Alternative 3 hydrology, floodplains, and water quality analysis in Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences, and Appendix C, Mitigation Measures.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project, including boundary adjustment and land transfer, would not physically divide an established community or encourage changes in adjacent land use. Although the project is currently zoned Agriculture and Forestry, the Del Norte County General Plan Element Revision, Issues Response Document (May 1, 1999) identifies this area as having Land Use designation conflicts with ownership, zoning or existing development. This document states in Chapter 6 (p. 79): "California Department of Parks has purchased lands on Aubell Lane off Elk Valley Road designated Agriculture and Forestry and should be updated to State Park," In addition, the county has determined that a conditional use permit is not required for this project. Therefore, this project will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation. The project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource				

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Aubell area is underlain by alluvial materials that have not been identified as significant mineral or aggregate deposits by the California Geological Survey.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working				

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

See the EA: Alternative 3 noise analysis in Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences, and Appendix C, Mitigation Measures.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed development of a park maintenance facility in the Aubell area within Redwood National and State Parks would not directly or indirectly induce population growth in the Crescent City area because it will not require additional staffing, and virtually all employees working at Reqa whose positions will be transferred to the new facility already live in the Crescent City area. There willl not be a need for new homes and will not affect visitation. The new maintenance facility would not displace any existing housing nor would it displace any people, and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Refer to the EA.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES --

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks	☐	☒	☐	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

See the EA: Alternative 3 park operations and facilities analysis in Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences and Appendix C, Mitigation Measures.

XIV. RECREATION:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

See the EA: Alternative 3 visitor experience analysis in Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences.

XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county				

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

See the EA: Alternative 3 transportation analysis in Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences, and Appendix C, Mitigation Measures.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Water would be supplied to the maintenance facility by connecting to the proposed water system on adjacent Elk Valley Rancheria property. See the EA: Alternative 3 park operations and facilities analysis in Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable? ("Cumulative considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

As described in the Alternative 3 analysis of the Aubell area in Chapter IV of the EA, Environmental Consequences, the proposed project was evaluated for potential significant adverse impacts to the natural environment. It has been determined that the proposed project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment and adversely affect wetlands, vegetation, wildlife and special-status animal species. The project also has potential adverse effects on soils and water quality through increased siltation and erosion. However, full implementation of all mitigation measures incorporated into this project (see Appendix C of the EA, Mitigation Measures) would avoid or reduce these potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The additive impacts of cumulative projects were analyzed and described for Alternative 3 in Chapter IV of the EA, Environmental Consequences. As disclosed in the cumulative impact analysis, the cumulative projects would contribute adverse environmental effects on the environment. However, impacts from environmental issues addressed in this evaluation do not overlap with these additional projects in such a way as to result in cumulative impacts that are greater than the sum of the parts or that result in a significant adverse impact that cannot be mitigated. Full implementation of all mitigation

measures associated with this and other projects would reduce any potential cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.

Most project-related environmental effects have been determined to pose less-than-significant impacts on humans. However, possible construction phase noise, air quality, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, and transportation/traffic impacts, though temporary in nature, have the potential to result in significant adverse effects. Operational (long-term) potential adverse impacts from hazards and hazardous materials and noise could also occur. However, these potentially significant adverse impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measures incorporated into this project (see Appendix C of the EA, Mitigation Measures).

List of Preparers

For a list of preparers, consultants, and planning team members, see Chapter V of the EA.

References

References can be found in Chapter VII of the EA.